UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,035	04/05/2001	Humberto A. Sanchez II	10006055-1	4855

7590   08/09/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/827,035	SANCHEZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Phuong N. Hoang	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 May 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2 - 14, 16 - 18, and 20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2 - 14, 16 - 18, and 20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2 - 14, 16 – 18, and 20 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 2, 3 – 9, 16, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat, US patent no. 6,366,954 in view of Mintz, US patent no. 6,305,007.**

4. Traversat and Mintz references were cited in the last office action.

5. **As to claim 2,** Traversat teaches a method for mapping objects mapping an object in LDAP repository to JSP server property (mapping of an LDAP directory server entry or attributes to the JSD server property, col. 5 lines 55 – col. 6 lines 13, wherein

the JSD server is stored in central repository (col. 7 lines 38 – 50) onto a lightweight

directory access protocol repository, comprising the steps of:

requesting that an object be stored in a lightweight directory access protocol

("LDAP") repository wherein the object includes attributes and is used in an object-

oriented programming application (storing object data in LDAP repository, col. 5 lines 60

– col. 6 lines 20);

retrieving (retrieved, col. 4 lines 25 – 37 and col. 12) a list of persistent attributes

from the object, wherein the persistent attributes are a subset (each entry is a collection

of attributes........one or move values, col. 6 lines 15 – 30) of the attributes and wherein

the persistent attributes each comprise a persistent attribute value;

determining a path, wherein the path identifies a location in the LDAP repository

(defining a path of ..... server property, col. 5 lines 55 – 60 and locations of data items,

col. 6 lines 13 – 18);

retrieving the persistent attribute values from the object (retrieved, col.4 lines 25

– 37, col. 6 lines 15 – 28, and col. 12); and

storing the object in the LDAP repository (storing object data in LDAP repository,

col. 5 lines 60 – col. 6 lines 13) so that the persistent attributes are stored in a format

that is useable by applications on the legacy system (information on the legacy system

would have accessible to client computers in an enterprise network, col. 2 lines 65 – col.

3 lines 5). Traversat also teaches mapping an object in LDAP repository to JSP server

property (mapping of an LDAP directory server entry or attributes to the JSD server

property, col. 5 lines 55 – col. 6 lines 13);

mapping the persistent attributes to LDAP attributes (LDAP entry is mapped to a

JSD entry, col. 12 lines 42 – 45);

passing the persistent attribute values to the LDAP repository (it is inherent when

in the mapping of an LDAP directory service to the JSD server, and the LDAP directory

service stores configuration data which is referred as JSD , col. 5 lines 39 – col. 6 lines

12);

storing the persistent attribute values in the LDAP attributes at the path based on

the mapping (the LDAP stores configuration data which is referred as JSD , col. 5 lines

39 – col. 6 lines 12).

Traversat teaches the purpose for storing large amount of data on LDAP, making

it available to all users on the network (col. 6 lines 6 – 12).

6.   Traversat does not explicitly teach the legacy system is non-object-oriented

programming application.

7.   Mintz teaches the application running on the legacy system is the non-object-

oriented programming application (the legacy application program is an application

written in a not-object oriented software programming language such as Fortran, Basic,

or C, col. 2 lines 19 – 28).

8.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Traversat and Mintz's system because

Mintz's non object-oriented applications running on the legacy system to access to the

enterprise network.

9.   **As to claim 3,** Traversat teaches wherein the persistent attributes each have a

name (DN for distinguished name, col. 6 lines 20 – 28) and wherein mapping the

persistent attributes to LDAP attributes comprises adding a prefix to the persistent

attribute name (naming configuration, col. 6 lines 29 – 35 and col. 7 lines 5 – 35)

10.   **As to claim 4,** Traversat teaches the step of wherein the prefix identifies the

object-oriented programming application and an organization (o for organization, col. 6

lines 20 – 28).

11.   **As to claim 5,** Traversat teaches the steps of wherein the persistent attribute

values are passed to the LDAP repository as an LDAP object comprising the LDAP

attributes and the persistent attribute values (col. 6 lines 19 – 28).

12.   **As to claim 6,** Traversat teaches the steps of the object-oriented programming

application has a name and the object has a name and wherein the path includes the

object-oriented programming application name, a container name and the object name

(application configuration data, col. 8 lines 28 – 32 and lines 50 – 65).

13. **As to claim 7,** Traversat teaches the steps of the object represents one of the following: a user, a node, a node group, a role or a tool because they are different types of data (profile category 415 contains application identifiers, nodes, col. 8 lines 50 – 65).

14. **As to claims 8 and 9,** Traversat teaches the step of wherein the objects are Java objects (Java object running on Java operating system, col. 4 lines 25 – 38).

15. **As to claim 16,** it is the medium claim of claim 2. See the rejection for claim 2 above.

16. **As to claim 17,** see rejection for claim 8 above.

17. **As to claim 20,** it is the system claim of claim 2. See the rejection for claim 2 above. Further, Traversat teaches a processor (microprocessor, col. 13 lines 51 – 67), a persistent data manager stores the object in the LDAP repository (directory services implemented with LDAP to store all types of information, col. 7 lines 1 – 5).

18. **Claims 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat, US patent no. 6,366,954 in view of Mintz, US patent no. 6,305,007, and further in view of Atkins, US patent no. 6,240,422.**

19.   Atkins reference was cited in the last office action.

20.   **As to claims 10 and 18,** Traversat and Mintz do not explicitly teach the step of

wherein the persistent attribute values are retrieved from the object using Java

reflection.

Atkins teaches the step of wherein the persistent attribute values are retrieved

from the object using Java reflection (using Java reflection to access to attributes, col. 3

lines 53 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Traversat, Mintz, and Atkins's system

because Atkin's Java reflection capability would provide accurate values when retrieving

data attributes.

21.   **Claims 11 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Traversat, US patent no. 6,366,954 in view of Helgeson, US patent no.

6,643,652.

22.   Helgeson reference was cited in the last office action.

23.   **As to claim 11,** Traversat teaches a method of retrieving objects mapped onto a

lightweight directory access protocol repository, comprising the steps of:

requesting that an object be stored in a lightweight directory access protocol

("LDAP") repository wherein the object includes attributes and is used in an object-

oriented programming application (storing object data in LDAP repository, col. 5 lines 60

– col. 6 lines 20);

retrieving (retrieved, col. 4 lines 25 – 37 and col. 12) a list of persistent attributes

from the object, wherein the persistent attributes are a subset (each entry is a collection

of attributes.......one or move values, col. 6 lines 15 – 30) of the attributes and wherein

the persistent attributes each comprise a persistent attribute value;

determining a path, wherein the path identifies a location in the LDAP repository

(LDAP server is the absolute of relative naming conventions used to define the locations

of data items, col. 6 lines 13 – 18);

retrieving (the JSD paths corresponding to the attributes in the LDAP entries are

retrieved, col. 4 lines 25 – 37, col. 6 lines 15 – 28, col. 10 lines 20 – 25, and col. 12) the

persistent attribute values from the location in the LDAP repository identified by the path

(locations of data items, col. 6 lines 13 – 18).

Traversat does not explicitly teach the step of setting the persistent attributes in

the object with the retrieved persistent attribute values.

Helgeson teaches the step of setting the persistent attributes in the object with

the retrieved persistent attribute values (for retrieving attribute values, one can use

methods like set to operate directly on the attributes, col. 28 lines 15 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Traversat and Helgeson's system

because Helgeson's methods for setting and getting attributes would be necessary step

for retrieving and populating the attributes.

24.   **As to claim 12,** Traversat modified by Helgeson teaches the step of invoking a

function to read (Helgeson; read, col. 44 lines 24 – 26) LDAP.

25.   **As to claim 13,** see rejection for claim 8 above.

26.   **As to claim 14,** Helgeson teaches the step of wherein the persistent attribute

values are retrieved from the object using Java reflection (the Java reflection ....for

retrieving attribute values, one can use methods like set to operate directly on the

attributes, col. 28 lines 15 – 60).

Response to Arguments

27.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/9/05 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

28.   Applicant argued in substance that

(1)   Traversat does not explicitly teach the step of mapping the persistent

attributes to LDAP attributes; passing the persistent attribute values to the LDAP

repository; and storing the persistent attribute values in the LDAP attributes at the path

based on the mapping as to claim 2.

(2)   Traversat does not explicitly teach the step of determining a path, wherein

the path identifies a location in the LDAP repository; retrieving the persistent attributes

values from the location in the LDAP repository identified by the path as recited in claim

11.

29.   Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's remark

As to point 1, Traversat teaches the step of mapping the persistent

attributes to LDAP attributes (LDAP entry is mapped to a JSD entry col. 12 lines

42 – 45, wherein the JSD server is stored in central repository (col. 7 lines 38 –

50), so the JSD attribute or entry is persistent attribute for accessing from any

software or applications in the network.

Traversat teaches the step of passing the persistent attribute values to

the LDAP repository (it is inherent when in the mapping of an LDAP directory

service to the JSD server, and the LDAP directory service stores configuration

data which is referred as JSD, col. 5 lines 39 – col. 6 lines 12);

Traversat teaches the step of storing the persistent attribute values in the LDAP attributes at the path based on the mapping (the LDAP stores configuration data which is referred as JSD , col. 5 lines 39 – col. 6 lines 12).

As to point 2, Traversat does not cite the path identifying a location in the LDAP repository, it functions as the path for identifying a location in the LDAP repository (LDAP server is the absolute of relative naming conventions used to define the locations of data items, col. 6 lines 13 – 18); Traversat teaches retrieving the persistent attributes values from the location in the LDAP repository identified by the path (the JSD paths corresponding to the attributes in the LDAP entries are retrieved, col. 4 lines 25 – 37, col. 6 lines 15 – 28, col. 10 lines 20 – 25, and col. 12).

Conclusion

30.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

31.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is

(571)272-3763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to

5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ph
July 25, 2005

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER